Spring 2021

# Maintaining a Relational Classroom While Implementing TS GOLD

Leslie K. Gustafson

# Maintaining a Relational Classroom While Implementing TS GOLD

Leslie K. Gustafson

Northwestern College

A Literature Review Presented
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Education
Dr. Theresa Pedersen

**Abstract**

Teaching Strategies GOLD is an authentic assessment tool. It is used in many preschool classrooms to observe student development in their daily routine. Teaching Strategies GOLD is an effective means of assessing student development. One of the challenges when implementing Teaching Strategies GOLD is its comprehensiveness. The extensiveness of the assessment has been found to be very time consuming for educators to implement. This has raised the question, "How does an educator maintain a relational classroom while implementing Teaching Strategies GOLD?" The purpose of this paper to research the value of preschool and the use of authentic assessment. It will look at the development of Teaching Strategies GOLD and its role in a preschool classroom. Also, it will also examine the use of data decision-making in preschool classrooms and the importance of teacher-student relationships. The hypothesis is that using consolidated forms and staff training, Teaching Strategies GOLD can be implemented in a more efficient and timesaving way resulting in more time for the teacher to build relationships with children and families.

*Keywords: Teaching Strategies GOLD, assessment, value, authentic assessment, teacher-student relationships*

## Table of Contents

## Introduction

Early Childhood Education has become a first step for many American children in their formal education. The United States currently has 96% of the 3- to 4-year-old population attending a state-funded preschool (Barnett et al., 2018). This figure encompasses 43 states including the District of Columbia. As the value of preschool has become more recognized, federal money has followed. Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge grants of over $1 billion were presented to 20 states as of January 2014 (Goldstein & Flake, 2015). The influx of federal and state dollars brought with it an increased need for accountability to ensure standards are being met (Mashburn & Henry, 2005; Goldstein & Flake, 2015).

Barnett and Carolan (2013) point out the states' support of preschool is evident not only through their financial contributions but also through the standards for high quality. The need to demonstrate program quality and monitor student development is often demonstrated using authentic assessment (Lambert, 2019; Kinay, 2018; Pool & Hampshire, 2018). Pool and Hampshire (2020) report the result of this requirement requires a significant amount of time. The problem then becomes a classroom focus which is more about academics than children (Minicozzi, 2016). The hypothesis that the process of authentic assessment can be consolidated to a more effective and efficient system of data collection will answer the question, "How can I maintain a strong relational classroom environment while implementing the use of the authentic assessment, Teaching Strategies GOLD?"

The coverage of this thematic literature review will demonstrate the value of preschool, the role of authentic assessment in preschool classrooms, and the increase in data-driven decision-making. In addition, an overview of Teaching Strategies GOLD and the importance of relationships between educators and students will be reviewed.

Research articles for this literature review were acquired through DeWitt Library, Northwestern College. The research of this topic was necessary to demonstrate the value of preschool, the role of authentic assessment, and how data-driven decision-making is utilized at the preschool level. The development of Teaching Strategies GOLD and the importance of teacher-student relationships in the classroom environment will conclude the research. The articles used for this research were written within the past ten years.

Teaching Strategies GOLD is a form of authentic assessment utilized in preschool programs. It requires documentation through observation of students involved in various everyday classroom activities (Burts & Kim, 2014). The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate how to maintain a relationally strong classroom while effectively implementing the requirements of the authentic assessment, Teaching Strategies GOLD. It will provide steps through a School Improvement Program to establish more efficient ways to make observations, collect and record data, and prepare and educate all staff in the classroom for its use. The creation and use of observational recording forms, associate scheduling and training will create the organizational framework to guide classroom staff. It will also create time for the teacher to focus more on relationship building and implementing differentiated instruction.

The first objective of this paper will be to look at state-funded preschool programs and their expectations. Second, it will look at the requirements and need for assessment. It will describe authentic assessment and its impact in a preschool classroom. It will then look at Teaching Strategies GOLD. The paper will explain Teaching Strategies GOLD goals and objectives for both students and teachers It will also look at the time investment needed to implement. Finally, this paper will look at the importance of teacher-student relationships in a preschool classroom. As these pieces are put together, the need for effective and efficient

methods of authentic assessment practices in the preschool classroom will be demonstrated.

## Literature Review

### The Value of Preschool

One theme among researchers regarding school readiness is the value of student participation in a Statewide Voluntary Preschool Program. Statewide Voluntary Preschool Programs (SWVPP) are preschool programs where a state provides financial funding for eligible four-year-old children to voluntarily enroll. The terms SWVPP and state or public funded preschool will be interchangeable for this literacy review. The goal of state-funded preschools is to prepare all eligible four-year-old children for kindergarten (Iowa Department of Education, 2020).

Barnett and team (2018) studied eight state-funded preschools across the United States. His goal was to study the cognitive impact of preschool on kindergarten students. Each classroom observed had a certified teacher and teacher assistant, maximum class size of 20 students, and was selected using the RD Design. Children were administered a 20- to 40-minute direct assessment as early as possible in the school year in their strongest language, either English or Spanish. Barnett compared school readiness of students who had attended preschool to those who had not upon entrance into kindergarten. Barnett's results found students who attended SWVPPs scored significantly higher in literacy than their peers who had not attended preschool. Math and language scores were also higher among the SWVPP attendees although not as high as the literacy scores (Barnett et al, 2018). He determined SWVPP can improve student development for both disadvantaged and general education students. He also felt teachers needed more professional development and recommended states measure the effectiveness of preschool programs and not base their assumptions on literacy scores.

Haslip (2018) conducted a study like Barnett's which compared the impact of public preschool on educational achievement. Haslip's study viewed archival data on student reading levels. He sought to answer whether attendance at the district's public-funded preschool impacted letter-sound identification, word identification, and text level reading at the beginning and middle of first grade. Haslip's study was conducted in an all-day Virginia program with classrooms of 18 students and certified classroom teachers and assistants. The first-grade classroom teacher administered the assessments using Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening to previous SWVPP attendees. Haslip's results affirmed Barnett's team (2018) finding that attending the SWVPP improved letter-sound identification. Haslip's (2018) study found preschool attendees were reading one full text level higher, more were reading above benchmarks, and making more consistent gains in first-grade literacy. Haslip also noted students not attending public funded preschool were more often in need of literacy interventions by the first grade. Haslip concluded by encouraging policymakers to invest in SWVPP. He felt it beneficial in avoiding future literacy interventions (Haslip, 2018).

A third study examined the value of Georgia public-funded preschools' impact on low-income, temperamental students' kindergarten academic and social readiness (Johnson et al, 2019). Johnson and team began evaluating children at nine months of age using the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Birth Cohort (Johnson et al, 2019). The act of using this evaluation system and caregiver interviews led Johnson and team to able to identify children with temperamental personalities. Those children were considered at-risk, specifically in potential behavior problems (Johnson, 2019). This same study compared those students to students who were also identified as temperamental and at-risk but remained at home in parental care until kindergarten. Johnson's team found temperamental at-risk students attending Head

Start, also a publicly funded preschool, were more developed socially than their public-school peers. The team suspected this was because Head Start teachers receive more training in early childhood development. Johnson's team found temperamental students who attended a public-school program were more advanced cognitively than their Head Start and parental care peers. The conclusion of the Johnson team was temperamental, low-income children benefit socially and academically from attendance in a public-funded program. Johnson's team's study (2019) further confirmed Haslip (2018) and Barnett's team (2018) findings there is academic value in preschool attendance.

Barnett and Carolan, (2013), in their foundational study, analyzed data from preschools across the United States to demonstrate the value of preschool. In their findings, they reported preschool programs were established to target high-risk students. Preschools have since expanded to include general education students. Barnett and Carolan (2013) found to improve quality education in public preschools the following were needed: licensed teachers, certified associates, and ongoing professional development. While these expectations lead to higher district costs, it has become a requirement in more states. The study noted 85% of state funded PreK programs now require early childhood training for teachers. Barnett and Carolan (2013) pointed out, due to the inconsistencies across the United States, many children who would benefit from preschool have the least opportunity to attend. The study concluded kindergarten entrance scores may not provide the full picture of a student's development nor the quality of the program.

Upon comparing the literature, it is clear the value of preschool can be demonstrated in more than one way. Barnett and team (2020) plus Haslip (2018) report preschool has a valuable impact upon students' academic performance, specifically in kindergarten and first grade. Barnett

(2020) and team demonstrated the value of preschool by researching developmental gains made by students who attended SWVPP. In contrast, Haslip (2018) took a different approach when he researched the first-grade level. He, too, found improvement in student literacy. Johnson (2018) and team agreed with Barnett and team (2020) and Haslip (2018) preschool improved academic performance. However, he was researching a specific group of at-risk students.

Johnson (2018) and team included in their research the value of preschool regarding social-emotional skills. Children identified at-risk due to low-income and temperamental issues benefited from the social emotional skills gained in the public-funded preschool environment. Barnett and Carolan (2013) viewed their analysis statistically as they examined the value of preschool through the provision of a quality program. They made specific note of the importance of teacher qualifications as did Johnson (2018) and his team. While Barnett and Carolan (2013) felt certified teachers were important, Johnson (2018) viewed the need for a specific early childhood degree to be valuable. It is evident these researchers define value differently, but they agree there is value in public-funded programs for preschoolers.

## Assessment

A second theme which arose when researching a relational preschool was assessment. The increase in public-funded preschools has brought with it a desire for accountability and has led to an increase in early-childhood assessments (Mashburn & Henry, 2005; Goldstein & Flake, 2015).

Goldstein & Flake (2015) reported there were multiple early childhood assessments. The Devereux Early Childhood Assessment, ECERS-R, The Effective Provision of Pre-school Education, Chinese Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale, The Early Years Foundation Stage Profile and The Early Development Instrument were a few. Their study found with the

wide selection of tools there needed to be a standard for validity. It was determined assessment is valid if it demonstrates accurate results, is administered by trained teachers, implemented honestly, and possesses quality content (Goldstein & Flake, 2015).

Early childhood assessments not only need to be valid, but they also need to cover a larger area of development (Goldstein & Flake, 2015). Researchers agree the best means to perform this type of assessment is through observation of the child in their natural environment (Goldstein & Flake, 2015; Lambert, 2019; Kinay, 2018; Pool & Hampshire, 2019). This type of assessment is known as authentic assessment (Lambert, 2020; Kinay, 2018; Pool & Hampshire, 2019).

Researchers agree authentic assessment in early childhood provides the clearest picture of student development (Lambert, 2020; Kinay, 2018; Pool & Hampshire, 2018). However, it is a very comprehensive assessment to administer (Lambert, 2020; Kinay, 2018; Pool & Hampshire, 2019). Authentic assessments are designed to assess multiple areas of student development through the collection of data (Lambert, 2020; Pool & Hampshire, 2019). Burts & Kim (2014) have agreed with Pool and Hampshire (2019) including families in the process can provide a wider range of authenticity. The use of authentic assessment can then drive a teacher's instruction by knowing where a student is developmentally, and which skill will be acquired next (Lambert, 2020).

Both Lambert (2020) and Kim (2016) noted the importance of teacher training when educators begin the process of administering authentic assessment. They also agreed one significant stressor for educators in the implementation of authentic assessment is its comprehensiveness (Lambert, 2020; Kim, 2016). Due to the number of developmental standards involved in early childhood, teachers find the time-demands required to implement authentic

assessment to be incredibly stressful (Kim, 2016). Lambert (2020) reported when teachers feel they are unable to meet the demands placed upon them, they experience stress. The Pool and Hampshire study (2020) addressed this issue and encouraged educators to develop a plan which could be implemented in classrooms. Their study revealed the development and use of planning forms to assist in organizing data collection. The review of the assessment domains can be a starting point for educators to condense material for convenience. The form needs to be usable by all staff and provide comparable results.

Overall, researchers agreed authentic assessment was the most effective assessment in early childhood education (Goldstein & Flake, 2015; Lambert, 2020; Kinay, 2018; Pool & Hampshire, 2019), because it offered the most accurate picture of student development (Lambert, 2020; Kinay, 2018; Pool & Hampshire, 2018). Burts & Kim (2014) along with Pool & Hampshire (2019) all agreed involving families in the assessment process adds to authentic assessment. While Lambert (2020) and Kim (2016) reported on the stressfulness and time constraints of implementing authentic assessment, Pool & Hampshire (2020) offered a solution by recommending the implementation of forms and checklists to collect the data. It was evident authentic assessment is the preferred form of preschool assessment.

## Teaching Strategies GOLD

A third theme in the research was the use of the authentic assessment method Teaching Strategies GOLD. Teaching Strategies GOLD is an observation assessment implemented by teachers (Burts, 2014; Lambert et al, 2014; Kim, 2016). It is the most frequently used authentic assessment by state-funded preschools (Kim, 2016). According to Burts & Kim, (2014), GOLD is to be used to monitor student development and drive teacher instruction. It took several years to produce Teaching Strategies and was created by a team of administrators, teachers,

consultants and professional development staff from Teaching Strategies, LLC (Burts & Kim, 2014). According to Kim (2016), its development was the result of government requesting a school-readiness data system.

Kim's (2016) study was conducted in four Head Start classrooms. It looked specifically at how Teaching Strategies GOLD influences early childhood programs. The data Kim collected from teacher interviews noted the use of the color bands which are part of the GOLD online system. Teachers found the use of the bands made it easy to determine which children needed additional intervention. However, Kim noted Teaching Strategies GOLD indicates its goal is to treat each child as individuals. The process of making a level deemed the standard per age group creates the opposite effect.

Kim (2016) found while GOLD marketed itself to make things easier for teachers, teachers indicated the opposite effect. Teachers reported spending their class time observing students, taking notes, and collecting data (Kim, 2016; Pool and Hampshire, 2020). The students free play time of 45-60 minutes became a focus of their data collecting. Kim also found GOLD to interrupt student play and be driving the instruction. If a teacher was missing data, they created an activity to document its completion. Kim's study concluded while TS GOLD was designed to eliminate standardized testing and instead assess the whole child, it is having the opposite effect. The need for constant assessing and data collection is intensifying teacher control by the need to be constantly collecting data.

The research conducted by Russo's team (2019) supported Kim's (2016) findings the implementation of Teaching Strategies GOLD takes a great deal of time. Additionally, Russo's team found GOLD did not assist in determining kindergarten readiness. Kim and team (2018) furthered the research when they examined GOLD in conjunction to dual language learners.

Kim's team found GOLD to be a valid assessment but recommended further study for dual language learners.

Both Lambert (2014) and Russo teams (2019) researched the effectiveness of the classroom teacher as the scorer of GOLD. The Russo team found outside trained raters' scoring to be much different than of the classroom teacher. Lambert's team cited Cabell and team (2009) when he reported classroom teacher's scores being much more subjective. Lambert's team also noted the importance of teacher training in the use of the administration of GOLD. It is clear from the data GOLD is a very time-consuming assessment tool (Lambert, 2020; Kim, 2016). It is also evident Teaching Strategies GOLD is a valid form of authentic assessment (Russo et al, 2019). It appears further research to assist in finding a balance or the implementation of a tool such as forms or checklists could be beneficial for educators (Pool & Hampshire, 2019).

## Data-Driven Decision-Making

Another theme which surfaced during the research of the literature was the implementation of data-driven decision-making. The historical report done by Gottried and team (2012) defined data-driven decision-making as the use of collected data to make decisions to improve student success. Early childhood has increased its efforts to compile data and train educators in how to implement it effectively (Little et al, 2019; Zweig et al, 2015). The Little team conducted a study in six counties in North Carolina. They found three sources of data available to PreK teachers. One source of data was a developmental screener administered to each student within 90 days (about three months) of attendance. A second source was the formative assessment Teaching Strategies GOLD. The final source being a State administrative data system (Little et al, 2019).

The purpose of the data was to drive decision-making. (Little et al, 2019; Gottfried, 2011). Little and team (2019) found the developmental screener was administered but often too late. They also found the opinions on the use of the GOLD data varied. One school reported their teachers embraced GOLD and used it to determine what to teach (Little et al, 2019). Another school reported they hired experienced teachers who found GOLD to be of little value. It was not used to drive instruction (Little et al, 2019). Questions were also raised as to how the data was transferred and used by kindergarten teachers (Little et al, 2019).

The study conducted by Little and team (2019) found data available for PreK teachers. Gottfried and team (2011) reported states in the process of creating databases for teacher use. Little's team (2019) reported training was provided on how to use the data. A qualitative survey of teachers using the data had mixed reports regarding the helpfulness of the training (Little et al, 2019) In the end, Little and team (2019) recommended further study needed to be conducted on how to utilize the data available to improve student learning.

Zweig and team (2015) also conducted a study of early childhood and data collection. Their qualitative research was conducted through interviews with teachers and administrators from seven preschools in the Northeast Region. The goal of the study was to determine how teachers and administrators collected data in preschool, how they used the data, and how they would like to use the data (Zweig et al, 2015). One data-collecting tool utilized by these preschools was Teaching Strategies GOLD (Zweig et al, 2015). Zweig's team (2015) and Little's team's (2019) had similar findings. The teachers implementing GOLD for data collection reported receiving proper training to implement the assessment tool (Little et al, 2019; Zweig et al, 2015).

The other assessment tools implemented were ECERS-R and informal assessment. All teachers reported feeling supported by administration (Zweig et al, 2015). All teachers interviewed indicated they utilized their data to drive instruction. Administrators required teachers to report data to parents and often data on attendance was used to reach out to families to ensure child presence (Zweig et al, 2015). When posed the question as to whether they would like to collect data, a couple of interviewees responded yes. However, it was indicated time would not permit (Zweig et al, 2015; Koyama, 2011).

The research indicates data-driven decision-making is part of preschool classrooms (Little et al, 2019; Zweig et al, 2015). Koyama (2011) in her foundational study researching the impact of No Child Left Behind on data collection reported a different perspective. She reported some areas of concern with the use of data. She noted that some schools were altering data levels to make their scores look better. There were other schools cutting teachers to buy more data materials (Koyama, 2011). Koyama (2011) reported there were for-profit businesses directing decisions for non-profit schools. She also reported an assistant principal who indicated conducting tests were more important than the test results. It becomes apparent data-driven decision-making can be beneficial if implemented correctly. As Zweig (2015) and Little (2019) indicated, utilizing the data to improve student education can be beneficial. However, it needs to be done with integrity and for the right motives (Koyama, 2011).

## The Importance of Relationships in the Classroom

The final theme from the research was relationships. A study done by Minicozzi (2016) interviewed four kindergarten teachers. The teachers discussed their concerns regarding the implementation of curriculum taught to achieve standards (Minicozzi, 2016). One teacher spoke to the concept of dual teaching. Dual teaching is the balance a teacher must reach when

implementing curriculum while working to maintain a developmentally appropriate classroom (Minicozzi, 2016). This teacher had returned to kindergarten specifically to assist in maintaining an environment where children were the focus. She indicated the children in her class drove her decision-making. The children were individuals and the curriculum had to be adapted in a way to meet their unique needs (Minicozzi, 2016).

Brebner and team (2015) shared Minicozzi's (2016) perspective in their research. They too reported in their interview-conducted research the importance of knowing and treating the children as individuals. Their qualitative study of two centers in Australia specifically asked for perspectives between children and caregivers. The responses revealed to understand the children developmentally, the caregivers needed to know the child (Brebner et al, 2015). Both centers noted relationships were active and required engagement. The study also revealed the need for time to develop quality relationships.

The difference between love and care were compared in both the Brebner and team (2015) and Zhang (2019) study. The Brebner study revealed the importance of loving each child equally. The Zhang study had a different perspective. It indicated parents did not care if their child was loved. They just wanted the caregiver to like them. The Zhang study went on to compare a caring and loving relationship to professional expectations. While Minicozzi (2016) and Brebner's team felt a caring relationship was extremely important, Zhang researched experts in the field who were concerned with the verbiage of love and care. The Zhang study revealed children who feel cared for will develop and learn more. Two of the interviews conducted by Zhang reported the reality of teaching is love. The others all agreed care was a more appropriate term to use professionally. Zhang's study noted regardless of the term care or love, the focus for educators should be to build a caring relationship with their students.

Cooper (2017) conducted a qualitative study of the importance of relationships at an early childhood center with 50 students. Her study found relationships were foundational in the development of children. Cooper also noted the importance of relationships between families and teachers. The study introduced the term emotional labor. Emotional labor is the ability to provide care while ignoring the personal stress it is causing (Cooper, 2017). Brebner and team (2015) also reported on this type of stress. Both Cooper and Brebner agreed relationship building with children is important and valuable but can create stress through care, assessment, and the student's progression to other classrooms. The studies also agreed it is important to be aware of emotional labor. Cooper recommended altering the assessment processes if it is enhancing stress and deterring from relationships.

Overall, the researchers agreed relationships in preschool are important and a foundation for student learning (Brebner et al, 2015; Cooper, 2017; Minicozzi, 2016; Zhang, 2019). It is with this in mind educators will need to find the balance between the expectations of standards and maintaining a relational and developmentally appropriate classroom.

## Conclusion

There is no doubt preschool can be an important learning environment for kindergarten readiness. The increase in public funding has made accountability a forefront issue in early childhood education. To obtain this accountability, legislators have increased requirements for authentic assessment in preschool classrooms. A commonly used tool for authentic assessment use is Teaching Strategies GOLD. The use of this tool can offer valuable information to assist teachers in improving their instruction. However, the implementation of Teaching Strategies GOLD and the desire for data-driven decision-making have had a significant impact on teacher-student relationships in the classroom. Teachers fear decisions are no longer being made for the

benefit of the child but for the standards they are expected to meet. The teacher-student relationships which propel student learning are being set aside for data collecting and documentation. Minicozzi (2016) offered strong insight by reporting some teachers use their curriculum as a resource. They allow the children's needs to drive their instruction and determine the atmosphere of their classroom. Zhang's (2019) study agreed an educator building relationships with students should be a top priority. Pool and Hampshire (2020) offered a solution for those situations which do not allow for any choice other than excessive documentation. They recommended condensed forms and checklists for classroom use.

The teaching philosophy which has guided my classroom for years is "loved children learn." It is imperative relationships remain at the center of education and the academics will follow. Relationships may cause emotional labor (Cooper, 2017), but the reward of improved student growth and development is well worth the investment. In the standards and assessment-based field of education, relationship building is a decision teachers need to make daily. It is possible to have a relational classroom while implementing assessments such as Teaching Strategies GOLD. The importance of providing a relational classroom is what led to the need for a School Improvement Plan at Immanuel Lutheran Preschool.

## Need for the Plan

Immanuel Lutheran Preschool (ILP) is a private preschool located in Schleswig, Iowa. It partners with the Statewide Voluntary Preschool Program and offers the Early Childhood Special Education Services for the Schleswig Community School District. It currently serves 14 students. One student will be excluded from the assessment data because her age makes her ineligible for SWVPP; however, she is eligible for the special education services provided. Table

1 includes Immanuel Lutheran Preschool's demographics. Table 2 includes Schleswig Community School's demographics.

**Table 1.**

*Immanuel Lutheran Preschool Demographics*

| Number of Students | Male | Female | ESL Students | Socio-Economic at Risk | IEP Students |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 |

**Table 2.**

*Schleswig Community School Demographics*

| Number of students | Male | Female | ESL Students | Socio-Economic At Risk | IEP Students |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 169 | 55% | 45% | 3% | 37.9% | 10.1% |

As members of the Statewide Voluntary Preschool Program, Immanuel Lutheran Preschool is required to assess students through the implementation of Teaching Strategies GOLD. Teaching Strategies GOLD is an authentic assessment in which teachers observe students in their natural daily environment. The teacher documents using anecdotal notes, video taking, auditory recordings, picture taking and checklists. The data collected through this assessment process is uploaded to the TS GOLD website. The implementation of TS GOLD took 58.5 minutes per week for a four-day week/half-day program (see Table 3). The extensive process necessary to collect and record the data takes time from the classroom instructor to build and maintain relationships (Russo et al, 2019; Kim, 2016). It also prevents educators from utilizing time after school to plan future lessons, create learning centers, and communicate with staff and other team professionals.

**Table 3.**

*Time Spent Implementing TS GOLD*

| Week # | Time Spent in Minutes | Overall Time in Minutes |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 42 | 42 |
| 2 | 3 | 45 |
| 3 | 48 | 93 |
| 4 | 23 | 116 |
| 5 | 45 | 161 |
| 6 | 30 | 191 |
| 7 | 80 | 271 |
| 8 | 70 | 341 |
| 9 | 64 | 405 |
| 10 | 180 | 585 |
| | | Final Total 585 |

Data taken during the year 2014-15 and 2015-16 at Open Arms Preschool (see Table 4) is a representation of a private preschool program which was operating without the use of TS GOLD. Table 5 shows the members of these two classes who attended Denison Community School who were given a Kindergarten Readiness Assessment based upon a 10-point rubric. This same rubric was used to assess the current 2020-21 class at Immanuel Lutheran Preschool. The lead teacher and director were the same at each location. The data results indicate the implementation of GOLD did not result in higher Kindergarten Readiness scores. Therefore, according to this data, the time spent implementing GOLD could be better spent investing in teacher-student relationships. As a result of this data and extent of time invested in GOLD, a School Improvement Plan has been developed. The plan will assist Immanuel Lutheran Preschool in administering GOLD more effectively and efficiently. It will free teacher time to invest in building relationships, scaffold instruction, and differentiate learning opportunities.

Qualitative data was collected using teacher surveys. (see Appendix B) Surveys were sent to preschool teachers from four local preschools. The feedback received shared a common

theme. The TS GOLD tool can be beneficial in assessing student development according to standards. However, the results also indicated the time required to implement GOLD did not warrant the results. One question asked of teachers was how they would assess students if they were not required to implement GOLD. Most teachers responded they would utilize report cards. Teachers were using report cards aligned with Teaching Strategies GOLD standards for Parent Teacher Conferences. The teachers also indicated the report card assessments were being utilized to drive their instruction.

Teachers were asked to give an estimate of time invested each week in collecting data for TS GOLD. The feedback indicated 1-2 hours per week. One survey feedback stated if they did not have to use GOLD, they would be able to implement interventions. The teacher indicated she would not be assessing every free minute she had. Instead, she would be teaching and building relationships. Another educator pointed out  if the developers of TS GOLD could find a new way to test each child, it would simplify the process. Instead of expecting the teachers to always be writing notes or taking videos to download for the proof, she would rather focus on teaching the lesson. One teacher surveyed indicated she liked using GOLD and would not opt for another form of assessment. However, she agreed with her professional peers  the documentation process needed to be more efficient and simplified.

The quantitative data indicated the use of GOLD lowered kindergarten readiness. The qualitative data was in complete agreement  the time commitment for GOLD was too great. It also showed an interference with teacher-student relationship building. It was clear from the data  a School Improvement Plan for Immanuel Lutheran Preschool was warranted. After seeking the approval of the Schleswig Community School principal, Mr. David Galvin, goals were developed to create a simplified means of implementing GOLD. These goals would be accomplished through the

training and scheduling of staff, providing the staff with simplified and specific checklists, and providing the staff the technology tools needed to record observations.

**Table 4.**

*Kindergarten Readiness Scores*

| Class and Year | Number of Students Tested | Boys | Girls | ESL Family | Socio-Economic at Risk | IEP Students | Kindergarten Readiness Scores Class Average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ILP 20/21 | 13 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 7.8 |
| OS 15/16 | 10 | NA | NA | 0 | 6 | 0 | 9.2 |
| OS 14/15 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 9.7 |

*Note: Students at Socio-economic risk were determined by those families who qualified for scholarship through the BVCS Empowerment. NA indicates data not available.*

**Table 5.**

*Denison Elementary Kindergarten Readiness Rubric*

| | 0 Points | 1 Point | 2 Points |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Cannot write any part of name | Writes some letters or part of name | Writes name |
| Rote Counting | 0-14 | 15-20 | 21-26 |
| Number ID | 0-12 | 13-15 | 16-21 |
| Uppercase ID | 0-14 | 15-20 | 21-26 |
| Lowercase ID | 0-14 | 15-20 | 21-26 |

## Goals and Measurement for the Plan

The objective of this school improvement plan is to produce an organized, effective, and efficient plan to implement the use of Teaching Strategies GOLD while maintaining a relational, spiritual, and developmentally appropriate preschool. The following goals will be implemented to achieve success.

The first goal of the school improvement plan is to reduce the amount of time spent collecting and recording data. The time spent will be reduced from one hour per week to 30

minutes per week. Immanuel Lutheran preschool and Schleswig Community School District will benefit through the time it makes available for the teacher to build relationships with students and families. It will also increase time for the teacher to develop more learning centers; specifically design instruction, differentiate the material, and reduce the stress level of the teacher. As the teacher stress level decreases so will the student. The second goal for the School Improvement Plan is to develop a systematic, efficient, and condensed system of monitoring student development. Checklists will be created to meet specific GOLD criteria, and staff will be trained in their use. (see Appendix C-H) These checklists will narrow staff's focus of skills to specific standards on specific days. They will provide staff immediate access to the rating scale and simplify what to observe. They will also reflect the exact standards needed for GOLD. The third goal for the Student Improvement Plan is to train classroom associates in the use of GOLD. All associates will be asked to attend the Teaching Strategies GOLD class offered by Northwest AEA. The fourth goal will be to improve efficiency of implementation. A monthly schedule will be created indicating what data will be collected on what day. Staff will be expected to enter their data collected on the computer by the end of the week. The final goal will be to provide each associate with an iPad with the Teaching Strategies GOLD application. Staff will be trained in its use and directed to upload artifacts to the GOLD website.

Goals one and two will be accomplished using condensed and more specific data collection forms. Forms have been developed and will have a designated day for completion. (see Appendix C-H) Each student will have a folder with one copy of each form. Staff will consult a monthly schedule indicating what objectives are to be observed on a specific day, document those skills in each child's folder, label the time spent collecting the data at the top of the page, and record data levels at the end of the school day. Pool and Hampshire (2019)

reported in their research the need for this type of systematic and efficient way to collect the data while assessing. The goal will be measured in November. Following the first Checkpoint, the time spent collecting data will be added up. This total in minutes will be compared to the total at the 2020 November Checkpoint. If the total averages 30 minutes or less per week, the goal will be successfully achieved.

The third, fourth, and fifth goal will work hand in hand. The first step necessary, as the delegation and sharing of data collection begins, is to train the staff. Barnett and Carolan (2013) voiced the importance of staff credentials in their research. The staff's training will make the assessment process more accurate and efficient. The local AEA has been contacted for available training dates. Following the AEA training and prior to the start of the 2021-22 school year, there will be a staff meeting. This meeting will involve the explanation and implementation of the checklists. Staff will be assigned specific standards to observe each week. They will document student observations on the simplified form and upload the data within a week's period. The success of these goals will be assessed at the first Checkpoint in November. The finalizing process often takes a significant amount of time to implement. As the staff enters data weekly, the finalization process will be shorter by eliminating missed objectives. This goal will be measured by averaging the time spent finalizing and entering data to see if the new average is 30 minutes per week or less.

The fifth goal is part of the above measurement system. Kim (2016) reported teachers felt overwhelmed by the technology and data entry connected to authentic assessment and GOLD. While she indicated Teaching Strategies GOLD solution was to invest a few minutes per day in the documentation process, Kim found the data entry to be equally stressful for educators. Having noted this, our staff will implement GOLD's suggestion and have staff implement the

use of iPads and iPhones to upload artifacts as well as the data collected on their forms. The entire staff assisting in the data collection will provide more time for teacher engagement in interventions, relationship building, and the scaffolding of student learning. The success of this goal will be measured by the number of artifacts and observations recorded. This will provide more time for the lead teacher to engage students. It will also assist the staff in becoming more aware and intentional in their engagement with students. As the staff makes observations and are intentional about student development, they will be better prepared in small group to assist children in attaining the next level of development.

The School Improvement Plan will be implemented in the fall of the 2021-22 school year. The schedule can be seen on Table 6.

**Table 6.**

*Timeline School Improvement Implementation*

| Date | Plan Implementation |
|---|---|
| Summer 2021 | Staff attends AEA GOLD Training |
| August 2021 | Staff meeting to explain assessment procedures and create student assessment folders. |
| September | Monday |
| Week 1 | Observe/Record TS Social Emotional |
| | Tuesday |
| | Observe/Record TS Physical |
| Week 2 | Monday |
| | Observe/Record TS Social Emotional |
| | Tuesday |
| | Observe/Record TS Physical |
| Week 3 | Monday |
| | Observe/Record TS Cognitive |
| | Tuesday |
| | Observe/Record TS Mathematics |
| Week 4 | Monday |
| | Observe/Record TS Cognitive |
| | Tuesday |
| | Observe/Record TS Mathematics |
| October | Monday |
| Week 1 | Observe/Record TS Language |
| | Tuesday |
| | Observe/Record TS Literacy |

| | |
|---|---|
| Week 2 | Monday<br>Observe Record TS Language<br>Tuesday<br>Observe Record TS Literacy |
| Week 3 and 4 | Monday/Tuesday<br>Upload additional artifacts |

The greatest barrier anticipated with the School Improvement Plan is the learning curve as the associates learn the system. The first year using Teaching Strategies GOLD can present challenges in learning the system and learning the objectives (Kim, 2016). The simplified assessment forms and staff training should ease these concerns.

## Assessment

The School Improvement Plan will be evaluated by both staff feedback (see Appendix Form A) and calculation of time investment in data collection and recording. This assessment will be conducted in November following the first GOLD Checkpoint. The benchmark for success will be an average of 30 minutes per week on GOLD. This will be half the time spent in the current year.

As stated at the beginning of the School Improvement Plan and the introduction to the capstone, Teaching Strategies GOLD is an authentic assessment mandated for use by the State of Iowa in public preschools and those private preschools partnering with the SWVPP. Each teacher surveyed indicated the TS GOLD is a quality assessment. However, each teacher also indicated TS GOLD is much too time consuming. The majority believed the benefits did not warrant the time investment. The number one request by teachers was a simplified version of TS GOLD. These teachers validated what Immanuel Lutheran Preschool found to be a concern. There was too much time and energy being invested in assessing and data collecting. Teachers wanted to spend their time building student and family relationships and improving interventions. This School Improvement Plan will accomplish goal.

## References

Barnett, S., & Carolan, M. (2013). Trends in State Funded Preschool in the United States: Findings from 10 Years of Policy Surveys. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy, 7*(1), 5-23. url: file:///C:/Users/owner/Downloads/Barnett-Carolan2013_Article_TrendsInStateFundedPreschoolIn%20(2).pdf

Barnett, W. S., Jung, K., Friedman-Krauss, A., Frede, E. C., Nores, M., Hustedt, J. T., . . . Daniel-Echols, M. (2018). State Prekindergarten Effects on Early Learning at Kindergarten Entry: An Analysis of Eight State Programs. *AERA Open, 4*(4), 1-16. url:10.1177/2332858418766291

Brebner, C., Hammond, L., Schaumloffel, N., & Lind, C. (2015). Using relationships as a tool: Early childhood educators' perspectives of the child-caregiver relationship in a childcare setting. *Early Child Development and Care, 185*(5), 709-726. url: dx.doi.org/10.1080/3004430.2014.951928

Burts, D. C., & Kim, D. (2014). The Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System: Measurement Properties and Use. *NHSA Dialog: The Research to Practice Journal for the Early Childhood Field, 17*(3), 122-135. Doi: https://journals.uncc.edu/dialog/article/view/170

Cooper, M. (2017). Reframing assessment: Reconceptualizing relationships and acknowledging emotional labour. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood, 18*(4), 375-386. url:10.1177/1463949117742784

Goldstein, J., & Flake, J. K. (2015). Towards a framework for the validation of early childhood assessment systems. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 28*(3), 273-293. url:10.1007/s11092-015-9231-8

Gottfried, M. A., Ikemoto, G. S., Orr, N., & Lemke, C. (2011). *What four states are doing to support local data-driven decision making: Policies, practices, and programs* (pp. 1-28, Rep. No. 118). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. Url: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/projects/project.asp?projectID=286

Haslip, M. (2018). The effects of public pre-kindergarten attendance on first grade literacy achievement: A strict study. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy, 12*(1), 1-19. url: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40723-017-0040-z

Johnson, A. D., Finch, J. E., & Phillips, D. A. (2019). Associations between publicly funded preschool and low-income children's kindergarten readiness: The moderating role of child temperament. *Developmental Psychology, 55*(3), 623-636. url:10.1037/dev0000651

Kim, D., Lambert, R. G., Durham, S., & Burts, D. C. (2018). Examining the validity of GOLD with 4-Year-Old dual language learners. *Early Education and Development, 29*(4), 477-493. url: doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2018.1460125

Kim, K. (2016). Teaching to the data collection? (Un)intended consequences of online child assessment system, "Teaching Strategies GOLD". *Global Studies of Childhood, 6*(1), 98-112. Doi:10.1177/2043610615627925

Kim, K. (2018). Early childhood teachers' work and technology in an era of assessment. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 26*(6), 927-939. url:10.1080/1350293x.2018.1533709

Kinay, I. (2018). Investigation of prospective teachers' beliefs towards authentic assessment. *World Journal of Education, 8*(1), 75-85. Doi:10.5430/wje. v8n1p75

Koyama, J. P. (2011). Generating, comparing, manipulating, categorizing, reporting, and sometimes fabricating data to comply with no child left behind mandates. *Journal of*

*Education Policy*, *26*(5), September, 701-720. Doi:https://eric.ed.gov/?q=Generating%2c+comparing%2c+manipulating%2c+categorizing%3a+reporting%2c+and+sometimes+fabricating+data+to+comply+with+No+Child+Left+Behind+mandates&id=EJ949186

Lambert, R. G. (2019). Shaping a validity argument for the use of authentic formative assessments to support young children. In *Handbook of Research on Formative Assessment in Pre-K Through Elementary Classrooms* (pp. 49-69). IGI Global. Doi:10.4018/978-1-7998-0323-2.ch003

Lambert, R. G., Kim, D., & Burts, D. C. (2013). Using teacher ratings to track the growth and development of young children using the Teaching Strategies GOLD®Assessment System. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, *32*(1), 27-39. Doi:10.1177/0734282913485214

Little, M. H., Cohen-Vogel, L., Sadler, J., & Merrill, B. (2019). Data-driven decision making in Early EDUCATION: Evidence from NORTH Carolina's PRE-K PROGRAM. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 27*, 18. doi:10.14507/epaa.27.4198

Mashburn, A. J., & Henry, G. T. (2005). Assessing school readiness: Validity and bias in preschool and Kindergarten Teachers' Ratings. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, *23*(4), 16-30. Doi:10.1111/j.1745-3992.2004.tb00165.x

Miller-Bains, K. L., Russo, J. M., Williford, A. P., DeCoster, J., & Cottone, E. A. (2017). Examining the validity of a multidimensional performance-based assessment at kindergarten entry. *AERA Open*, *3*(2), 233285841770696. Doi:10.1177/2332858417706969

Minicozzi, L. L. (2016). The garden is thorny: Teaching kindergarten in the age of accountability. *Global Studies of Childhood, 6*(3), 299-310. Doi:10.1177/20436106166648173. Doi: 10.1016/j.ecresq.2015.05.004

Pellegrino, J. W. (n.d.). Rethinking and redesigning education assessment: Preschool through postsecondary. *Education Commission of the States ECS,* 1-10. Doi: https://eric.ed.gov/?q=rethinking+and+redesigning+education+assessment&id=ED456136

Pool, J. L., PhD, & Hampshire, P., PhD. (September 2020). Planning for authentic assessment using unstructured and structured observation in the preschool classroom. *Young Exceptional Children, 23*(3), 143-156. Doi:10.1177/1096250619846919

Russo, J.M., Williford, A.P., Markowitz, A.J., Vitiello, V.E. & Bassok, D. (2019). Examining the validity of a widely used school readiness assessment: Implications for teachers and early childhood programs. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 48*, 14-25. Doi: 10.1016/j.ecresq.2019.02.003

Zhang, Q. (2019). Ruminating on love and care in early childhood teaching. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 40*(3), 256-274. Doi:10.1080/10901027.2018.1561561

Zweig, J., Irwin, C. W., Kook, J. F., & Cox, J. (2015). data collection and use in early childhood education programs: evidence from the northeast region. *Stated briefly U.S. Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences,* 1-7. url: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED555738.pdf

# Appendix A

## Teaching Strategies GOLD Checklists and Implementation Staff Feedback

1. What did you find the most beneficial regarding the use of GOLD?
2. Were the checklists convenient to use? How could they be improved?
3. Did you feel properly trained to implement the checklists and website?
4. Do you feel the checklists impacted your relationships with students or families?
5. How much time did you spend on the website documenting objectives?
6. How much total time in minutes did you spend collecting and uploading the data?

Thank you for your assistance in making the classroom run more smoothly.

## Appendix B

Teacher Survey: Teaching Strategies GOLD

1. What is your favorite thing about the use of TS GOLD?
2. What do you find the most challenging about implementing GOLD?
3. What would make the implementation of GOLD more effective?
4. On average, what is your estimated time commitment to the implementation of GOLD each week?
5. If you were not required to do GOLD, how would you use this time differently? Which would be your preference, to continue GOLD use or discontinue GOLD use?
6. How often do you use the GOLD information to drive instruction?
7. How do you determine what will be assessed and when?
8. If you did not use GOLD, how would you assess and what would look differently about your day?
9. Would you find a simplified or condensed version of GOLD beneficial?
10. Anything else you would like to share?

Name: _____(optional)

Thank you!!!!!!

## Appendix C

## Social Emotional TS Documentation

Child's name_____ Observer's name_____ Date_____

| **Objective 1: Manages Feelings. Please circle which number applies** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Today, when the above student did not get his/her way, how did they respond? | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Meltdown | Found a teacher | Found a friend or object | Altered Perspective |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Controlled emotions | Self-calms | Demonstrates patience | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Today, when above student needed something, how did they respond? | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Said nothing | Wants adult to help | Tries to do it alone | Confidently attempts it alone |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Takes responsibility to meet own needs | Practices skills to accomplish independently | Identifies personal strengths | |

| **Objective 2b: Establishes Positive Relationships. Please circle which number applies.** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| How does the above student connect with adults relationally? | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Will not engage | Trusts 1 or more adults | Will leave the adult to explore | Not afraid to be away from adult |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Engages with adult as a positive resource or to share common interest | Asks adults questions and talks about interests | Talks to adult, offers different opinion respectfully | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| When the above student sees someone crying, upset, or angry, how do they respond? | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| No response | Reacts to other's emotions | Shows concern | Reacts to other's emotions and knows what is wrong |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Understands others feel differently than them | Understands people can have more than one feeling at a time | Applies past self-experiences and relates it to other's situations | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| How does the above student respond when interacting with his/her peers? | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Does not play with others | Plays beside others | Engages with peers | Maintains play with peers |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Plays with groups of 4-5 students | Works with others towards a goal | When playing in a group, student can lead or follow | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Participates in a group setting. Please circle the number which applies. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Does not respond to others | Responds to others when they ask for something | Takes turns | Offers to share with peers |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Cooperates and shares | Completes cooperative projects | Can explain their role in a group project | |

# Appendix D

## Physical TS Documentation

Please circle appropriate answers.

Child's name_____ Observer's name_____ Date_____

| **Objective 4. Demonstrates Traveling Skills. Please circle what applies.** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| How does the child travel across the room? | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Doesn't travel yet | Moves to explore environment | Hops, walks, rolls, runs | Controls body<br>Does not run into peers |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Advanced movements<br>Skips, runs backwards, twirls | Changes directions | Complex movements while traveling | |

| **Objective 5: Demonstrates Balancing Skills** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Is the child able to demonstrate balance? | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not Yet | Sits and plays with toys | Can stand on tiptoes | Jump off a low step<br>Walks to sandbox |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Can hop on one foot<br>Can walk on a balance beam | Can stop running and balance as an animal | Balance on balance beam and change directions.<br>Stands on apparatus for 3-5 seconds | |

| **Objective 6: Demonstrates Gross-Motor Manipulative Skills** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Is the student able to perform these gross motor activities? | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| No gross motor yet | Grabs and holds on to an object | Throws ball with a straight arm | Throws ball with bent arm |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Throws ball with full range of motion | Throw and catch with accuracy | | |

| **Demonstrates Fine-Motor Manipulative Skills and Coordination** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Uses fingers and hands | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not Yet | Reaches, touches, holds objects<br>Uses tweezers to pick up items<br>Snaps own pants | Dumps sand into a container | Turns knobs<br>Uses eating utensils<br>Zips own coat |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Strings beads<br>Builds with small blocks | Traces letters<br>Stays within the lines | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Can child use writing tools? | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| No | Grabs pencil or marker and jabs at paper | Holds pencil with whole hand and moves entire arm | 3-point finger grasp |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Uses enough pressure when writing | Holds paper correctly | Writes with more speed | |

## Appendix E

## Language TS Documentation

Please circle appropriate answers.

Child's name_____ Observer's name_____ Date_____

| **Objective 8: Listens to and Understands Increasingly Complex Language** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does the student have language? 8a | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Acknowledges when people speak | Comprehends directions | Listens when peer tells a story |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Answers questions | Asks questions of peer's story | NA for preschoolers | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does the student follow directions? 8b | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Responds non-verbally to direction | Follows a simple command | Follows 2-step direction |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Follows multi-step direction | Asks for clarification of directions | | |

| **Uses Language to Express Thoughts and Needs** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Is the student using expanding language? 9a | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not Yet | Gestures to communicate | Is able to name an object | Describes the use of familiar items |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | 14-15 |
| Uses a new vocabulary word | Gives directions to peers | Uses adjectives when talking | Talks with multiple exchanges and larger words |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does the child speak clearly? 9b | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Babbles sounds | Uses phrases like "Where is bankit?" | Is understood by most people |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | 14-15 |
| Pronounces multisyllabic words | Can adjust speed and volume of speech | Is understood by peers when telling a story | Uses expression when speaking |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student can use conventional grammar. 9c | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| No | Uses one-or two-word sentences | Uses 3-4-word sentences | Speaks in 4-6-word sentences |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Uses long sentences with correct grammar | Uses correct tense | NA Preschool | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student tells about another time or place. 9d | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Simple statements<br>Ex: Got shoes | Tells story<br>Shares few details | Tells story about another time and place |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Tells an elaborate story about another time or place | Tells stories with a clear sequence of events | Retells a story they've herd | |

| **Uses Appropriate Conversational and other Communication Skills** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student engages in conversation. 10a | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Engages in back-and-forth conversation | Initiates brief conversations | Engages in conversations of at least three exchanges |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | 14-15 |
| Engages in conversations of at least five exchanges | Engages in conversations and asks questions | Connects conversation to own life experiences | NA for preschool |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students uses of social rules of language. 10b | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Looks at person talking | Makes eye contact | Doesn't interrupt |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | 14-15 |
| Knows inside and outside voice | Listens and takes turns in conversation | Doesn't speak over peers | Asks for ideas in group projects |

## Appendix F

## Cognitive TS Documentation

Please circle appropriate answers.

Child's name_____ Observer's name_____ Date_____

| **Objective 11. Demonstrates Positive Approaches to Learning** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does the student attend and engage? 11a | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Turns head to a voice speaking | Plays with toy once | Contributes to stories at the rug |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | 14-15 |
| Returns to same center expanding play | Ignores distractions to continue task at hand | Can play a board game until finished | NA |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Is the student persistent? 11b | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Repeats action. Bangs toys repeatedly. | Practices until successful Ex. Writing name, stacking blocks | Continues with difficult task until successful |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Plans goal until reached Ex. Builds a bridge that holds body weight out of blocks | Plans and completes project Ex. Builds a house like the Three Little Pigs | Begins a challenging task (Putting together a hard puzzle) | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student is able to solve hard problems. 11c | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Works to solve a problem (Unstick scissors, get stuck piece out of toy) | Imitates problem solving | Solves problems without needing to try several solutions |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Thinks about problem offers solution<br>Example: Solution to problem in the story | Tries multiple things to solve problem | NA Preschool | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does the child show curiosity? 11d | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Uses senses to explore<br>Touches an object<br>Turns toward sounds | Explores and investigates<br>Takes things a part to see how they work | Eager to learn<br>Attentive during stories |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | 14-15 |
| Finds resources to expand learning<br>Gets butterfly book after seeing one at recess | Excited to learn new things | Shows interest in expanding subjects<br>Draws clouds, watches documentary on human body | Asks thoughtful questions. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Child demonstrates flexibility in thinking. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| No | Imitates others | Demonstrates creativity in play | Adapts |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | 14-15 |
| Thinks through long term solutions<br>Offers suggestions to improve things | Uses creative ways to complete a task<br>Uses paint at Art Center and finishes with beads | Is able to adapt to a schedule change | Can speak in a way a peer can understand |

| **Objective 12. Remembers and Connects Experiences** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student can recognize and recall. 12a | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Recognizes people and objects | Remembers things from last few months | Tells story in order of events |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Uses strategies to remember<br>Example: Puts items in backpack to remember to take home | Uses rehearsal strategies<br>Practices spelling name over and over | NA Preschool | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student can make connections. 12b | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Looks for object when named | Remembers sequence of routine. | Applies everyday experience to other situations. |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | 14-15 |
| Applies rules to other situations<br>Do not run in the room applies to hallway | Connects past to present | First Easter, then birthday<br>Understands future events | Remembers former students |

| **Objective 13: Uses Classification Skills** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student uses classifications skills. 13a | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Matches | Sorts 2 groups | Sorts by shape then by color |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Sorts big red, little red<br>Switches all big, all small | Sorts Dramatic Play Center<br>Veggies, dairy, etc.<br>Students think symbolically | Sorts zoo animals, farm animals<br>Sports, then sub categories | |

| **Objective 14. Uses Symbols and Images to Represent Something not Present** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student thinks symbolically. 14a | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Recognizes objects or people in photos | Draws or builds<br>Identifies what it is | Plans what to play and follows up<br>Let's play house. I will be the mom |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Represents objects with abstract symbols<br>Tally marks, graphs with assistance | NA | NA | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student engages in socio-dramatic play. 14b. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| No | Imitates others | Acts out imaginary or real scenarios such as talking on the phone, making supper | Engages in dramatic play with two or three other peers |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Engages in advanced dramatic play<br>Doctor who talks to patients | Creates props for play | NA | |

## Appendix G

### Literacy TS Documentation

Please circle appropriate answers.

Child's name_____ Observer's name_____ Date_____

Please check below the box which applies to the student's developmental level.

| **Objective 15. Demonstrates Phonological Awareness** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student notices and discriminates rhyme.15a. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| No | Joins in rhyming songs | Fills in missing rhyming word<br>The fat cat sat on the ____ | Generates a group of rhyming words<br>Bat, lat, fat, sat |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| NA | NA | NA | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student notices discrimination alliteration. 15b. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| No | Sings songs with same beginning | Shows awareness words begin the same way | Matches beginning sounds |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Identifies beginning sounds | NA | NA | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Notices and discriminates smaller and smaller units of sound. 15c. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Shows awareness of separate words in sentences. | Shows awareness of separate syllables in words | Verbally blends and separates onset rime in words |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Reads CVC words | | | |

| **Objective 16. Demonstrates Knowledge of the Alphabet** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Identifies and names letters 16a. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Demonstrates knowledge that a specific set of letters makes a word | Sounds out some simple words | Sounds out one and two syllable words |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| NA | NA | NA | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Uses letter-sound knowledge 16b. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| None | Knows sounds of five letters | Names sounds of 10-20 letters | Knows sounds of all 26 letters |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| NA | NA | NA | |

| **Demonstrates Knowledge of Print and Its Uses** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Uses and appreciates books. 17a. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Interested in books | Holds book correctly | Knows title and author |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Uses books for their intended purpose | NA | NA | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Uses print concepts. 17b. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| NA | NA | NA | |

| **Objective 18. Comprehends and Responds to Books** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Interacts during read-aloud and book conversations. 18a. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Fills in repetitive phrases in book as teacher reads | Asks and answers questions about the book | Identifies problems in the story and offers solutions |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Looks at a picture in the book and tells what happened in the story. | NA | NA | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Uses emergent readings skills. 18b | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Pretends to read | Pretends to read repeating language heard from story | Tries to match oral language to words on page |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| NA | NA | NA | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Retells stories. 18c | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Retells some events from the story | Shares details from a non-fiction story | Retells story using proper sequence |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| NA | NA | NA | |

18d Not applicable to preschool

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Reads simple text 18e | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Reads peers' names from roster | Reads beginning readers | NA |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| NA | NA | NA | |

| **Objective 19 Demonstrates Emergent Writing Skills** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Writes name 19a. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Makes scribbles | Linear scribbles | Letter forms |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Letter strings | Partial first name | Accurate first name | Accurate first and last name |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Writes to convey information 19b | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Drawing and scribbles | Drawing lines | Drawing, dictation, and mock letters |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Drawing, dictation, and letter strings | Early invented spelling | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Writing with conventions 19c | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| None | Prints many upper- and lower-case letters | Prints all upper- and lower-case letters | Uses capitalization and punctuation |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Complex capitalization | NA | NA | |

## Appendix H

## Math TS Documentation

Please circle appropriate answers.

Child's name_____ Observer's name_____ Date_____

| **Objective 20. Uses Number Concepts and Operations** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Counts 20a. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Counts out of order | Counts to 10<br>Counts five objects | Counts to 20<br>Counts 10-20 objects |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Counts to 100<br>Counts by 10's<br>Counts 30 objects | NA | NA | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Quantifies 20b. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Understands 1, 2, and 3 | Names number in a small set | Makes sets of 6-10 objects |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Knows ½<br>Knows if there are 12 friends and 4 more come it makes 16 | NA | NA | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Connects numerals to their quantities 20c. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Identifies a few numerals | Identifies numerals 1-5 | Identifies numerals 1-10 |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Identifies numerals 1-20 | Identifies numerals 1-120 | NA | |

20e, 20f, and 20g are not preschool applicable

| **Explores and Describes Spatial Relationships and Shapes** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Understands spatial relationships 21a | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Positional words in, out, up and down | Proximity words Beside, on top of, under | Follow directive example walk backwards, move forward |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Uses maps and pictures to find objects | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Understands shapes 21b. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Matches 2 shapes | Identifies a few basic shapes | Describes 2- and 3 dimensional shapes |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Identifies shapes stay the same even when turned | Feels a shape in a box and can tell what it is | NA | |

| **Compares and Measures** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Measures 22a. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Compares two objects | Orders small set smallest largest | Measures using paper clips, jelly beans, blocks, etc. |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| Uses measurement words accurately | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Measures time and money 22b. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Knows sequence of daily events | Relates time to daily routines | Uses some measurement and time words |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| NA | NA | NA | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Represents and analyzes data 22c. | | | |
| 0-1 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 |
| Not yet | Knows 1st, 2nd, 3rd etc. | Creates and reads simple graphs | Reads graph with three entries |
| | | | |
| 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | |
| NA | NA | NA | |

## Appendix I

## TS GOLD Data Recording Sheet

Please transfer student scores below.

Objective _____

| Name | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |